REMARKS

I. Introduction

Claims 1-38 are pending in the application. In a December 23, 2005, Office Action (hereinafter "Office Action"), Claims 1-3, 5-9, 11, 12, 14-19, 21-24, 26-31, 34, 36-38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,374,252, issued to Althoff et al. (herein "Althoff et al."). Claims 4, 10, 13, 20, 25, 32, 33 and 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Althoff et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,499,062, issued to Shetyn (herein "Shetyn").

For the following reasons, applicants respectfully submit that the rejected claims of the present application are patentable over the various combinations of Althoff et al. and Shetyn because the cited and applied references, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each of the limitations recited with regard to independent Claims 1, 17 and 29. Prior to discussing more detailed reasons why applicants believe that all the claims of the present invention are allowable, a brief description of the present invention and the cited references are presented.

A. Summary of the Present Invention

The present application is directed to a method and system for processing object property changes. In accordance with an illustrative embodiment of the present invention, a computer system receives a request to process at least one object property. The computer system begins a property change defer cycle that allows for the grouping of the specific object property change into one or more object property change groups. In the event the object property change creates additional property changes or additional property change requests are received during the property change defer cycle, the additional property changes are grouped into object property change groups. Upon completion of the property change defer cycle, the object property groupings are implemented.

LAW OFFICES OF
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS PLLC
1420 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2800
Seattle, Washington 98101
206.682.8100

Numerous advantages may be realized by the system or method recited in the claims of the present application. In one aspect, the property change defer cycle facilitates the grouping of property changes. Accordingly, the computer system mitigates sequential display object property changes related to the change of a display object property. Additional advantages may also be realized within the present invention.

B. U.S. Patent No. 6,374,525 to Althoff et al.

Althoff et al. is purportedly directed toward a method and system for compiling and translating between object-oriented database structures and relational database structures. Generally described, Althoff et al. describes three functions for the interaction between an object-oriented database and a relational database: 1) creating, editing or manipulating an object database and its corresponding translation to the relational database; 2) creating, editing or manipulating objects within the object database and its corresponding translation to the relational database; or 3) creating, editing, or manipulating queries for the object database and its corresponding translation to the relational database.

Althoff et al., however, does not teach or suggest a system or method for processing property group changes. Specifically, Althoff et al. fails to teach or suggest processing a received display object property change during a property change defer cycle.

LAW OFFICES OF
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS PLLC
1420 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2800
Seattle, Washington 98101
206.682.8100

C. U.S. Patent No. 6,499,062 to Shetyn

Shetyn is purportedly directed toward various components for representing information processing system controls via software objects. Shetyn teaches the use of two-way programmable routes to facilitate the modification of additional software object properties upon the modification of a target software object property. Shetyn fails to teach or suggest entering one or more property change defer cycles to process display object property changes.

II. The Claims Distinguished

A. Claim 1

As amended, Claim 1 reads as follows:

> 1. A method for processing display object property changes, the method comprising:
>
> obtaining a request to process at least one display object property change, the request corresponding to a software application object;
>
> initiating a property change defer cycle;
>
> processing the at least one object property change;
>
> determining the end of the property change defer cycle; and
>
> implementing the processed at least one display object property change upon the determination of the end of the property change defer cycle.

As described above, Claim 1 recites a method for processing display object property changes. Claim 1 specifically recites "obtaining a request to process at least one display object property change" and "initiating a property change defer cycle." Claim 1 further recites "processing the at least one display object property change" and "implementing the processed at least one display object property change upon the determination of the end of the property change defer cycle." By initiating a property change defer cycle upon receipt of a display object property change request, the method facilitates the grouping of any additional or subsequent

LAW OFFICES OF
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS PLLC
1420 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2800
Seattle, Washington 98101
206.682.8100

display object property group changes processed during the property change defer cycle prior to implementation of the display object property change.

With regard to Claim 1, the Office Action asserts that Althoff et al. discloses the elements recited in Claim 1 through a description of the building and editing of an object database model (Figure 6, Col. 21, lines 12-21). Specifically, the Office Action asserts that Althoff et al. teaches a "transaction begin" and "transaction end" command that collects and commits user changes to a database model. The Office Action states that the teaching of the "transaction begin" and "transaction end" commands are equivalent to the property change defer cycle recited in Claim 1. The Office Action further states that the teaching of the commitment of the database entries upon completion of the "transaction end" command is equivalent to the implementation of the display object change. For the following reasons, applicant respectfully disagrees.

Althoff et al. is limited to teaching an interface between an object-oriented database and a relational database. The portion of Althoff et al. relied upon by the Office Action to reject Claim 1 is a data entry step for a routine for building a data model of an object oriented database. (Col. 21, lines 8-11). In this regard, Althoff et al. teaches the collection of database object entries (either the creation of new objects or the editing of an existing object). The database entries are subsequently made to the data model upon completion of the data collection command. "[A]ll changes to the user database model 230 or to the relational database 250 are *collected*, and committed in one atomic operation when the user 201 invokes the "transaction end" command." (Col. 21, lines 16-20) (emphasis added). Although applicant does not agree that Althoff et al. teaches entering a property change defer cycle or the implementation of the processed display object changes, Althoff et al. clearly does not teach the processing of the display object changes as recited in Claim 1. To this regard, the Office Action is relying on the same concepts taught in Althoff et al. to teach the "processing the at least one display object

LAW OFFICES OF
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS PLLC
1420 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2800
Seattle, Washington 98101
206.682.8100

property change" and "implementing the processed at least one display object property change upon the determination of the end of the property change defer cycle."

To anticipate a claim under § 102(e), the cited reference must teach each and every element recited in the claim. *Verdegaal Bros. v Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631 (Fed. Cir. 1987). With regard to Claim 1, applicant respectfully submits that the cited reference, Althoff et al. fails to teach at least "processing the at least one display object property change," as recited in the claim. For these reasons, applicant respectfully requests a withdrawal of the § 102(e) rejection with regard to Claim 1.

B. Claims 2-16

Claims 2-16 are dependent on Claim 1. As discussed above, Althoff et al. fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations recited with regard to Claim 1. Accordingly, for the above-mentioned reasons, Claims 2-16 are allowable over the cited art, alone or in combination. In addition, Claims 2-16 further add to the patentability of applicant's invention, the details of which are discussed below.

Dependent Claim 5 adds to the patentability of applicant's invention "associating a property change group category to the at least one object property change." The Office Action asserts that Althoff et al. teaches this limitation in citing Figure 4, block 411. Applicant respectfully submits, however, the cited portion of Althoff et al. relates to a "Class Object Edit Permission" property which can be inherited by other objects in the data model. (Col. 19, lines 54-62). The cited portion in no way relates to the association of a property change group category that is associated with a requested property change group. Accordingly, the cited reference further fails to teach, or suggest, the additional limitation recited in Claim 5.

Dependent Claim 5 adds to the patentability of applicant's invention "associating a property change group category to the at least one object property change." The Office Action asserts that Althoff et al. teaches this limitation in citing Figure 4, block 411. Applicant

LAW OFFICES OF
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS PLLC
1420 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2800
Seattle, Washington 98101
206.682.8100

respectfully submits, however, the cited portion of Althoff et al. relates to a "Class Object Edit Permission" property which can be inherited by other objects in the data model. (Col. 19, lines 54-62). The cited portion in no way relates to the association of a property change group category that is associated with a requested property change group. Accordingly, the cited reference further fails to teach, or suggest, the additional limitation recited in Claim 5.

Dependent Claim 6 adds to the patentability of applicant's invention "generating a property change group memory array, the property change group memory array including array elements corresponding to a display object associated with the property change request." Additionally, dependent Claims 7-8 recite further limitations related to the property change group memory array recited in Claim 6. The Office Action asserts that Althoff et al. teaches a property change group array by citing Table 9-2. Applicant respectfully submits, however, the cited portion of Althoff et al. relates to the utilization of an array for returning the contents of multiple database rows for faster processing results. "When large numbers of rows are to be selected from a table, the system attempts to fetch those rows in an array, for faster retrieval." (Col. 28, lines 7-9). The cited portion in no way relates to teaching an array that is used to group property change groups to display objects as recited in the claim. Accordingly, the cited reference further fails to teach, or suggest, the additional limitations recited in Claims 6-8.

Dependent Claim 10 adds to the patentability of applicant's invention "initiating a second property change defer cycle," processing any additional display property changes corresponding to the implementation of the property changes obtained in the property change request," and determining the end of the second property change defer cycle." Applicant agrees with the Office Action that Althoff et al. fails to teach or suggest the additional limitations recited in Claim 10. However, the Office Action asserts that Shetyn teaches initiating a second property change defer cycle for processing additional display object property changes. Applicant respectfully submits, however, the cited portion of Shetyn relates to a GUI for configuring a control system that includes three user programmable "routes" for configuring different controls.

LAW OFFICES OF
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS PLLC
1420 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2800
Seattle, Washington 98101
206.682.8100

Shetyn in no way teaches or suggests a single property change defer cycle. Accordingly, it could not teach a second, embedded property change defer cycle. Accordingly, the cited references further fail to teach, or suggest, the additional limitations recited in Claim 10. Dependent Claim 11, which recites additional limitations related to a second property defer cycle, would also be further patentable for the reasons cited with regard to Claim 10.

C. Independent Claim 17

In a manner similar to independent Claim 1, independent Claim 17 recites a method for processing display object property changes. Claim 17 specifically recites:

> 17. In a computer system having a display, a memory including at least one software application, and an operating environment, a method for processing display object property changes, the method comprising:
>
> obtaining a request from the software application to process at least one object property change corresponding to a display object associated with the software application;
>
> initiating a first property change defer cycle;
>
> associating a property change group category to the at least one object property change;
>
> identifying additional display object property changes corresponding to the implementation of the at least one object property change;
>
> initiating a second property change defer cycle;
>
> processing any additional property changes corresponding to the implementation of the at least one object property change;
>
> determining the end of the second property change defer cycle;
>
> determining the end of the first property change defer cycle; and
>
> implementing the processed property changes upon the determination of the end of the first property change defer cycle.

As stated above with regard to Claims 1 and 10, Althoff et al. fails to teach or suggest entering into two property change defer cycles in which display object property changes are processed. The cited art is limited to teaching an interface between an object-oriented database

LAW OFFICES OF
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS PLLC
1420 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2800
Seattle, Washington 98101
206.682.8100

and a relational database. For these reasons, and the reasons, set forth above, applicant respectfully requests a withdrawal of the § 102(e) rejection of Claim 17.

D. Claims 18-28

Claims 18-28 are dependent on Claim 17. As discussed above, Althoff et al. fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations recited with regard to Claim 17. Accordingly, for the above-mentioned reasons, Claims 18-28 are allowable over the cited art, alone or in combination. In addition, Claims 18-28 further add to the patentability of applicant's invention, the details of which were discussed above with regard to dependent Claims 2-16. For these reasons, applicant respectfully requests a withdrawal of the § 102(e) rejection of Claims 18-28.

E. Independent Claim 29

In a manner similar to independent Claim 1, independent Claim 29 recites a method for processing display object property changes. Claim 29 specifically recites:

> 29. A method for processing object property changes, the method comprising:
>
> obtaining a request to process at least one object property change, the request corresponding to a software application object;
>
> initiating a first property change defer cycle;
>
> generating a property change group memory array, the property change group memory array including array elements corresponding to an object associated with the property change request.
>
> populating the property change group memory array with a property change group category associated with the at least one object property change;
>
> for each memory array element, identifying additional display object property changes corresponding to the implementation of the at least one object property change;
>
> initiating a second property change defer cycle;
>
> processing any additional property changes corresponding to the implementation of the at least one object property change;

LAW OFFICES OF
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS PLLC
1420 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2800
Seattle, Washington 98101
206.682.8100

determining the end of the second property change defer cycle

determining the end of the first property change defer cycle; and

implementing the processed at least one object property change upon the determination of the end of the first property change defer cycle.

As stated above with regard to Claims 1, 6 and 10, Althoff et al. fails to teach or suggest entering into two property change defer cycles in which display object property changes are processed. Althoff et al. further fails to teach the utilization of property change group memory array for grouping display object property group classifications. The cited art is limited to teaching an interface between an object-oriented database and a relational database. For these reasons, and the reasons, set forth above, applicant respectfully requests a withdrawal of the § 102(e) rejection of Claim 29.

F. Claims 30-38

Claims 30-38 are dependent on Claim 29. As discussed above, Althoff et al. fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations recited with regard to Claim 29. Accordingly, for the above-mentioned reasons, Claims 30-38 are allowable over the cited art, alone or in combination. In addition, Claims 30-38 further add to the patentability of applicant's invention, the details of which were discussed above with regard to dependent Claims 2-16. For these reasons, applicant respectfully requests a withdrawal of the § 102(e) rejection of Claims 30-38.

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

LAW OFFICES OF
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS PLLC
1420 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2800
Seattle, Washington 98101
206.682.8100

III. Conclusion

Based on the above-referenced arguments, applicant respectfully submits that all the claims of the present application, Claims 1-38 are allowable over the cited and applied references. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of all the rejections of the claims of the present invention and allowance of the present application. If any questions remain, applicants request that the Examiner contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR
JOHNSON KINDNESS[PLLC]

Mauricio A. Uribe
Registration No. 46,206
Direct Dial No. 206.695.1728

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service in a sealed envelope as first class mail with postage thereon fully prepaid and addressed to Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on the below date.

Date: June 23, 2005

MAU:mau

LAW OFFICES OF
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS[PLLC]
1420 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2800
Seattle, Washington 98101
206.682.8100